



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,645	05/01/2001	Tom Milner	10004560-1	4840

7590 04/14/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SCHNEIDER, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/846,645	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MILNER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joshua D. Schneider	<b>Art Unit</b> 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*Fritz Fleming*  
**FRITZ FLEMING**  
*Supervisory* **PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 2100**  
*4/13/2006*  
*4/28/06*

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 1/10/2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Fritz Fleming signing for Kim Huynh

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/10/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. However, a new rejection is given for the purpose of clarifying the issues at hand and preparing the issues for appeal. The rejection to claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph has been withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2182

2. With regards to claims 21, 26, and 31, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, Applicants argue that the description of a software element's function (i.e., identifying the type of device) is considered adequate for enablement under M.P.E.P. § 2106.01, because one of ordinary skill in the art is capable of writing code to fulfill that function. However, this software elements function that is found to be lacking.

3. The rejection sets forth that there is no teaching that code retrieved from the device for identifying the type of device is executable code. The code retrieved is taught in the specification to be a property file. This property file is always a passive element that simply contains certain types of data, and because the property file is passive, it cannot in itself determine the code to be executed. Rather, the property file is utilized to determine the device type, but does not determine the device type itself (page 4, lines 3-5 of the originally filed specification). A teaching of such a limitation is not found on pages 7 or 8 as identified by Applicant. It is still not found anywhere in the specification where the code *retrieved from the device* for identifying the type of device is executable code. In the specification code being executed is located on the server, or host, but never on the device from which the identification code is retrieved. The arguments with regards to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, are therefore not persuasive. A new rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is set forth to clarify the question of what the applicant intends to be claiming.

4. With regards to claims 22, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, Applicant states that a system object ID (or SysObjID) is explicitly referred to at page 6 (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph). The specification never teaches

limiting the invention to not be but instead does teach the use of a system object ID as argued by applicant. Applicant has shown no basis for this argument, and the acronym SysObjID is still not found anywhere in the specification. Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. See *In re Johnson*, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977) (“[the] specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part remaining.”). The mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion.

5. With regards to claims 14, 15, and 17, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,122,639 to Babu et al., Applicant’s argument is not persuasive. Applicant has argued that the device type is determined before the lookup of the device type identifier in a device type table. This is not true. Given that the device discovery of Babu retrieves the same system object ID that the applicant claims, it is unclear how the claims of the instant application would not also know the identification of the device when the system object ID is retrieved (see page 8 lines 23-26 of the originally filed specification). Applicant’s arguments must not be found to be persuasive, or must be found to be self-defeating.

6. A good analogy of what is going on in Babu is the lookup of a bar code by a cash register in a grocery store. After reading the identification, a bar code, information on a box, the computer in the cash register does not know what is in the box. Rather it takes this identification, and compares it against a table or database of known identifications. Only after it has found a matching identification does the register discover that the box contains corn flakes, and its other associated information, such as price, size, and discounts that apply. Likewise, the host unit in this case does not know the device type when the device type identifier is retrieved, but rather has gained the information necessary to identify the device. If Applicant was to give

Art Unit: 2182

an examiner a customer number, but this number is only used to get the information that defines the customer. This is very clearly the way virtually all identifiers are used, whether it be a employee ID number or a social security number, it only leads to the information that is necessary to truly identify the person. The arguments are therefore found to be unpersuasive.

7. Finally it is now made of record that the applicant did not traverse the examiner's assertion of that object oriented programming is common knowledge or well-known in the art statement, and as such this statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 711, 60 USPQ 239, (CCPA 1943).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

10. With regards to claims 21, 26, and 31, it is not found anywhere in the specification where the code retrieved from the device for identifying the type of device is executable code. The specification describes retrieving the passive property files (pages 8-11) that are **utilized** to identify the devices, and never makes reference to them containing executable code portions.

Art Unit: 2182

11. With regards to claims 22, the specification never refers to the acronym SysObjID in the specification. Further, Applicant claims using a system object identifier in claim 30, and describes the retrieval of a system object ID as part of the preferred embodiment (see page 8 lines 23-26 of the originally filed specification). This is defined by the reference applied in earlier rejections but not in the Applicants specification. It would also appear that the applicant is using conflicting limitations.

12. With further regards to claims 26, 31, and 33, the specification never defines what the nature of a device is and how it is discovered.

13. With further regards to claim 31, the specification never teaches the existence of multiple executable code sets. There is only one paragraph (summary of invention) that ever mentions an identifying code set and there are not multiple instances of such executable code.

14. With regards to claim 33 and 34, the specification never discusses how the target device can be identified without regard to the device control protocol or in a plurality of device control protocols.

15. Claims 23-25, 27-30, and 32-36 are rejected for including the non-enabled subject matter of the claims from which they depend.

16. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

17. Claims 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2182

18. With regards to claim 21, it is unclear how a property file designates a code set. In a normal context, a property file is a passive constant that does in itself nothing. This constant is used by executable code to determine and discover other things. Thus the word “designates” must be read in light of the specification to mean “is utilized to identify” executable code that determines whether the device associated with a particular I/O path is the type of device defined by said property file in order to be enabled. It is doubtful that one of ordinary skill in the art would make such a reading and it is therefore indefinite as to what is intended to be claimed.

19. Claim 26 recites the limitation "said property file" in the last three lines of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

20. With further regards to claims 26, it is unclear what is being determined in that last step of the claim. It is assumed that in the second retrieving limitation is supposed to recite retrieving a property file. However, the second and third limitations of the claim are then cause confusion. The second limitation recites retrieving a property (file) defining the nature of a known device. The third limitations recites executing code associated with said property file, wherein said code is operable to uniquely identify said target device, and operable to determine whether or not said property file defines the nature of said uniquely identified device. It is unclear how one determines whether or not said property file defines the nature of a device when the property (file) is defined as defining the nature of a known device. This seems to be the exact argument that applicant has used to address the rejection of claims 14, 15, and 17, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,122,639 to Babu et al., but is then being claimed by the applicant in these claims.



Art Unit: 2182

21. With regards to claim 31, it is unclear how a processor can call a property file. The property file is not an executable code that can be “called” by the processor to be executed in the normal definition of the word. The property file is a static data file that can be used by executable code, but cannot be executed itself.

22. Claims 23-25, 27-30, and 32-36 are rejected for including the same unclear subject matter of the claims from which they depend.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 14, 15, 17, 21, 23-27, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,122,639 to Babu et al.

25. With regards to claim 14, 17, 21, 23-27, Babu teaches retrieving a plurality of property files from a predefined subdirectory; wherein each property file of said plurality of property files describes a type of device (Fig. 3, elements 302-314, column 2, line 64, through column 3, line 10, and column 3, lines 45-47). Babu teaches determining whether a device associated with said I/O path is the type of device described by the property file associated with said object method (column 2, line 64, through column 3, line 10). Babu teaches a plurality of methods may be used to identify the device, such as new device identification (Fig. 3) or device update detection (Fig. 4A). Removing a class identifier from each property file of said property files, wherein each class identifier identifies a class; creating object of the respective class of each class identifier;

Art Unit: 2182

and calling a specific method from a plurality of methods for each created object would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, as object oriented programming was well known in the art in order to increase portability and competitiveness in the computer marketplace through the use of leading edge technology. It is now made of record that the applicant did not traverse the examiner's assertion of that object oriented programming is common knowledge or well-known in the art statement, and as such this statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 711, 60 USPQ 239, (CCPA 1943).

26. With regards to claim 15, Babu teaches adding a new storage device to said storage area network (column 1, lines 44-55), wherein said new storage device is caused to be associated with said I/O path, and wherein said new storage device is a new type of device to said storage area network, and storing a new property file in said predefined subdirectory describing said new type of device (column 2, line 64, through column 3, lines 67). The restarting code of a management server to thereby cause repetition of steps utilizing said new property file, is inherent to the continued running of the process to track and update device information (column 4, lines 51-64).

27. With regards to claims 17 and 30, Babu teaches a default property file of said plurality of property files identifies a simple network management protocol (SNMP) class, wherein said default SNMP class defines a method to identify devices by a comparing a SNMP system object identifier to at least one field in said default property file (Fig. 5, column 8, lines 7-24, and column 2, line 65, through column 3, line 54).

Art Unit: 2182

28. Claims 16 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,122,639 to Babu et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0161852 to Allen et al.

29. With regards to claims 16 and 29, Babu fails to explicitly teach the use of SCSI identifiers. Allen teaches that SCSI devices are well known in the art, and a default property file of said plurality of property files identifies a default small computer system interface (SCSI) class, wherein said default SCSI class defines a method to identify devices by comparing SCSI vendor identifier and product identifier information to at least one field in said default property file (page 4, paragraph 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the SCSI identifiers of Allen with the Device defining of Babu in order to accommodate new device types according to an agreed upon protocol.

30. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in further view of U.S. Patent 6,122,639 to Babu et al.

31. With regards to claim 18, the AAPA teaches a storage area network (SAN) comprising: a plurality of servers, wherein said servers are communicatively coupled to a fabric of said SAN (page 2, lines 12-24); Babu teaches host agent processes, wherein each of said host agent processes executes on a respective server of said plurality of servers, and wherein said host agent processes are operable to query devices associated with host logical unit numbers I/O paths of said SAN to gather device information (column 2, line 65, through column 3, line 54), a management server, wherein said management server employs a simple network management protocol (SNMP) manager process to query devices associated with SNMP I/O paths of said SAN to gather device information (column 3, lines 46-54), a plurality of property files stored in a

Art Unit: 2182

predefined directory, wherein each property file of said plurality of property files describes a type of device, and wherein each property file of said plurality of property files includes an identifier of code operable to determine whether a device associated with an I/O path is the type of device described by its associated property file (column 2, line 65, through column 3, line 10), and, a management server process, wherein said management server process is operable to receive gathered device information from said plurality of host agent processes and from said SNMP manager process; and wherein said management server process is operable to call code identified by property files with gathered device information as arguments to thereby identify types of devices associated with I/O paths of said SAN (column 3, lines 46-67). Babu teaches uniquely identifying each device (column 14, line 62, through column 15, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the plurality of servers of the AAPA with the device detection of Babu et al. in order for a network to be able to easily accommodate new device types in a network in which a change has occurred

32. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and U.S. Patent 6,122,639 to Babu et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0161852 to Allen et al.

33. With regards to claim 19, the AAPA and Babu teaches creating an array of identifiers including each said identifier from each property file (Fig. 5, column 8, lines 7-24, and column 2, line 65, through column 3, line 54). Allen teaches a plurality of small computer system interface (SCSI) device discovery objects utilizing identifiers from said array that identify SCSI device classes (page 4, paragraph 30), and Babu teaches a plurality of SNMP device discovery objects

Art Unit: 2182

utilizing identifiers from said array that identify SNMP device classes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the SCSI identifiers of Allen with the device defining of the AAPA and Babu in order to accommodate new device types according to an agreed upon protocol. Code instantiating objects from an array of identifiers would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, as object oriented programming was well known in the art.

34. With regards to claim 20, the AAPA Babu fails to explicitly teach the use of SCSI identifiers. Allen teaches SCSI device discovery object for each host logical unit numbers I/O path (page 4, paragraph 30); and Babu teaches SNMP device discovery object for each SNMP I/O path (column 3, lines 46-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the SCSI identifiers of Allen with the device defining of the AAPA and Babu in order to accommodate new device types according to an agreed upon protocol. Code calling a method of each instantiated object would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, as object oriented programming was well known in the art.

35. Claim 31 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs, set forth in this Office action.

36. Claims 32-36 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2182

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Schneider whose telephone number is (571) 272-4158. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDS

*Fritz Fleming*  
Supervisory FRITZ FLEMING  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2100  
AU 2181 4/13/2006